



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/739,506	12/18/2000	Leo Carl Christensen	US000344***	3124
24737	7590	05/19/2004	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			BLOUNT, STEVEN	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2661	7

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/739,506	CHRISTENSEN, LEO CARL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Steven Blount	2661

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1 – 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 8, “said k respective bit selectors” lacks antecedent basis. In claim 2, line 4, “said k random access memories” lacks antecedent basis.

4. Claims 1 – 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In claim 1, it is stated that M bit selectors read portions of the J identical images (stored in RAM), and that K bit selectors construct K output data streams.

However, on page 8, line 13 of the specification, it is stated that after the data on the bus is read into a first portion 250, 254 of each of K RAMs, “address controllers” (not

Art Unit: 2661

bit selectors, as claimed) read from second portions 252, 256 of the RAMs and then the bit selectors 140 generate the output streams.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,208,641 to Ruuskanen et al.

Ruuskanen et al teaches a signal router comprising a controller used to store data in memory (see col 4 line 56, "under the control of a common write address counter") Ruuskanen et al also teaches a controller for reading from memory (see col 4, line 64, "The selector corresponding to the line selects, under the control of the control memory the bit ..."). Although the controllers cited above appear to be separate units, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have them incorporated into one functional unit that performs both functions in order to simplify the design and construction.

7. Claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,208,641 to Ruuskanen et al in view of U.S. patent 6,430,180 to Bohm et al.

With regard to claim 1, Ruuskanen et al teaches a signal router that has elements for writing into memory via a signal transducer during a first time interval (col

4, line 18; col 4, line 55; see also address counter 12); and reading out the data via control read portions from memory (col 4 line 63) to construct output data streams via a selector (col 4 line 64) during a second time interval (col 4 lines 17+). Ruuskanen et al does not however teach the memory to be RAM memory (though this is very likely).

Bohm et al teaches a similar process occurring through the use of RAM memory. See the abstract and col 3 lines 30+. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used RAM memory in Ruuskanen et al, in light of the teachings of Bohm et al in order to allow for a fast response time.

With regard to claim 2, writing a second set of images during the second time interval would be obvious in view of the teachings of Ruuskanen et al at col 4 line 15, and also the teachings of Bohm et al – see col 3, lines 17+ (as input bitstream is written...data for the output bit streams are read out (emphasis added)).

With regard to claim 3, a buss is taught in Bohm et al, see the area to the right of numerals 32 and 33.

With regard to claim 5, see the rejection of Ruuskanen et al in paragraph 6 above, and again see the buss cited above in Bohm et al.

With regard to claim 6, it is obvious that the aggregated amount of data rates on the buss in Ruuskanen et al/Bohm et al (see again the area to the right of numeral 32 in Bohm et al) would be greater than the individual data rates leaving the memory units on member 14 in Ruuskanen et al; or via 5, 6, etc on Bohm et al.

With regard to claim 7, note that time multiplexing is taught in col 2 line 53 of Ruuskanen et al, note the discussion of RAM above, and note that a demultiplexing

Art Unit: 2661

process is carried out in Ruuskanen et al in col 4, lines 63+. See also the selector (SEL) to the left of unit 14 in figure 1 of Ruuskanen et al.

7. Examiner Steven Blount may be reached at 703-305-0319 Monday through Friday between the hours of 9:00 and 5:30.


Ajit Patel
Primary Examiner

SB


5/14/04